UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,574	08/29/2006	Hendrik Dohle	23387	1571
535 K.F. ROSS P.C	7590 01/14/200	EXAMINER		
5683 RIVERDA SUITE 203 BO		SUITTE, BRYANT P		
BRONX, NY 1			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/553,574	DOHLE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	BRYANT SUITTE	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION	N FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, af al (with appeal fee) in compli	fidavit, or other evidence, wance with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set ter than SIX MONTHS from the b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHE	mailing date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding an hortened statutory period for repl	nount of the fee. The appropria y originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(	e)), to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the c	sideration and/or search (sea v); er form for appeal by materia	e NOTE below); illy reducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	11. See attached Notice of No	on-Compliant Amendment (I	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 3-9. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		☑ will be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	sufficient reasons why the a	ffidavit or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under	appeal and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·	
<ul> <li>11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li> </ul>			ce because:
13. Other: See attached document for figure.			
/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed October 20, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's principle arguments are: a) the prior art does not anticipate the instant independent claim 8 of the invention. b) the prior art does not anticipate the instant independent claim 4 of the invention. In response to Applicant's arguments, pleases consider the following comments. a) Kosako discloses a fuel cell comprising all the components disclosed by instant application. The diffusion layer (15) of fuel cell engages directly the membrane of the fuel cell. See figure 1B. The projections (19) of the diffusion layer (15) are directly engaging the membrane of the fuel cell. A catalyst layer (16) forms an opposite face of the cathode turned away from the anode. See figure 1B. As disclosed by figure 8, a separator (free cathode compartment) is disposed or bound to the fuel cell. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993), therefore, the Applicant can not argue the intended use of the prior art because, the instant independent claim 8, does not claim the utilization of the fuel cell, it only describes the structure of the low temperature fuel cell. b) The prior art discloses a fuel cell that can have the protons produced on the anode side of the fuel cell and travel through the membrane to the diffusion layer of the cathode and then to the catalyst layer of the fuel cell as depicted by the attached figure. Therefore, the prior art can have a similar transportation of protons in the fuel cell as compared to the instant application.